



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,645	09/26/2003	Kirk A. Buhler	KB01-02U	8215

37038 7590 03/22/2005

BUHLER ASSOCIATES  
BUHLER, KIRK A.  
2687 SCENIC CREST LANE  
CORONA, CA 92881

EXAMINER
----------

JULES, FRANTZ F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3617

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/672,645	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUHLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Frantz F. Jules	<b>Art Unit</b> 3617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 15-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/01/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-14 in the reply filed on 01/18/2005 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 15-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 01/18/2005.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the recitation of "a third cover member connected with a bearing to the inner or outer member from claim 8" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

Art Unit: 3617

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The specification fails to disclose to an ordinary skill in the art how to construct an outer member which is made from a material consisting of metal, plastic and rubber as recited in claims 4 and 11.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 2-7 and 9-14 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2, line 1, the phrase "The attachment mechanism in claim 1" is improper to current standard of the dependent claims which requires that the preamble of a dependent claim be similar to that of the independent claim. A wheel cover is originally claimed in the preamble of claim 1. It is suggested that claim 2 begins with a phrase such as: —The wheel cover as recited in claim 1, wherein an attachment mechanism is ...—. Similar correction should be made to claims 3-4, 7, 9-12 and 14.

In claim 6, line 1, the phrase "a third cover member connected with a bearing to the inner or outer member from claim 1" is improper to current standard of the dependent

Art Unit: 3617

claim which requires that the preamble of a dependent claim be similar to that of the independent claim. A wheel cover is originally claimed in claim 1. It is suggested that claim 6 begins with a phrase such as: —The wheel cover as recited in claim 1, wherein a third cover member is ...—. Similar correction should be made to claim 13.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 7-8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Whiteman (US 2,997,344).

Whiteman discloses a wheel cover for a vehicle comprising an inner member 13 with an attachment mechanism for connecting to a vehicle rim as discloses in col 1, lines 69-70, at least one outer member (33) that is not eccentrically weighted, a bearing mechanism (30) that connects the inner member to the outer member to allow the members to turn independently from each other. The outer member is located on or off axis from the axis of the inner member as shown in fig. 2-3

8. Claims 1-2, 7-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang (US 6,702,396).

Wang discloses a wheel cover for a vehicle comprising an inner member (42) with attachment mechanism (43) for connecting to a vehicle rim as discloses in col 1, lines

Art Unit: 3617

26-27, at least one outer member (8) that is not eccentrically weighted, a bearing mechanism (47) that connects the inner member to the outer member to allow the members to turn independently from each other. The outer member is located on or off axis from the axis of the inner member as shown in fig. 2-3.

The attachment mechanism consisting of clips or springs in accordance with claims 2 and 9.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Wallach (US 6,820,475).

Claims 2 and 9

Whiteman teaches all the limitations claims 2 and 9 except for a wheel cover comprising an attachment mechanism consisting of clips or springs. The general concept of providing an attachment mechanism consisting of spring and clips to a wheel cover is well known in the art as illustrated by Wallach which discloses the teaching of clips or springs (24) to locate a wheel cover, see fig. 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Whiteman to include the use of an attachment mechanism comprising springs or clips in his advantageous wheel

Art Unit: 3617

cover as taught by Walach in order to facilitate installation of the wheel cover thereby removing the risk of personal injury.

Claims 4-5, 11-12

Regarding using an outer member made of a material consisting of metal, plastic and rubber and bearings made from ball bearings, plastic bearings and bronze bearings as recited in claims 4-5 and 11-12, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Whiteman to include the use of an outer member made of a material consisting of metal, plastic and rubber and bearings made from ball bearings, plastic bearings and bronze bearings in his advantageous system, as material selection is a common and everyday occurrence throughout the wheel cover design art and the specific use of an outer member made of a material consisting of metal, plastic and rubber and bearings made from ball bearings, plastic bearings and bronze bearings would have been an obvious matter of design preference depending upon such factors as the wind loading imposed on the wheel cover, the maximum speed of the vehicle, the yield strength of the bearing and the outer member; the ordinarily skilled artisan choosing the best stress profile corresponding to a particular loading imposed on the wheel cover which would most optimize the cost and performance of the device for a particular application at hand, based upon the above noted common design criteria.

Claims 6 and 13

Regarding using a third cover member connected with the bearing to the inner and outer member as recited in claims 6 and 13, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Whiteman to include the use a third cover member connected with the bearing to the inner and outer member in his advantageous system, as the duplication /reduction of identical parts which perform essentially the same function is a common occurrence throughout the wheel cover design arts, and the specific number of cover member used on a wheel cover would have been an obvious duplication of parts, depending upon such common factors as the loading imposed on the wheel cover, the yield strength of the bearing and cover material, the weight of the wheel cover; the ordinarily skilled artisan choosing the best number of cover members which would most optimize the cost and performance of the device for a particular application at hand, based upon the above noted common design criteria.

11. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiteman (US 2,997,344) in view of Schurig (US 6,135,569).

Whiteman teaches all the limitations claims 3 and 10 except for a wheel cover comprising an attachment mechanism consisting of one or more magnets. The general concept of providing an attachment mechanism consisting of one or more magnets to a wheel cover is well known in the art as illustrated by Schurig which discloses the teaching of one or more magnet (38, 42) to locate a wheel cover, see fig. 3. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Whiteman to include the use of an attachment mechanism comprising one or more



Art Unit: 3617

magnets in his advantageous wheel cover as taught by Schurig in order to facilitate installation of the wheel cover thereby removing the risk of personal injury.

***Conclusion***

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Good, Hettinger are cited to show related wheel cover comprising an independently rotating member.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz F. Jules whose telephone number is (703) 308-8780. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph S. Morano can be reached on (703) 308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3617

Frantz F. Jules  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3617

FFJ

March 15, 2005

**FRANTZ F. JULES**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Frantz F. Jules', written over a horizontal line.